

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LASHAWN LOUIS GREEN,

Defendant and Appellant.

E056646

(Super.Ct.No. RIF133650)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Bernard Schwartz, Judge.
Affirmed.

Lise M. Breakey, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant and appellant Lashawn Louis Green appeals after the trial court denied
his postjudgment motion to receive additional conduct credit pursuant to amended Penal
Code section 4019. We affirm the trial court's order.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Defendant was convicted of various drug-related charges with priors. On March 3, 2008, he was sentenced to a total term of seven years in state prison and awarded 128 days of presentence credit (86 days actual credit for time served plus 42 days conduct credit).

On June 21, 2012, defendant filed an ex parte motion for an order correcting his presentence custody credit, claiming he was entitled to 44 days of additional conduct credit pursuant to the amended provisions of Penal Code section 4019. The trial court denied defendant's request, finding that defendant was not entitled to additional credit pursuant to the new provisions of Penal Code section 4019. This appeal followed.

DISCUSSION

Defendant appealed and, upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts and potential arguable issues, and requesting this court to conduct an independent review of the record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but he has not done so. Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have independently reviewed the record for potential error and find no arguable issues.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ
P. J.

We concur:

McKINSTER
J.

MILLER
J.